REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 13 have been cancelled. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is therefore moot.

Concerning the rejection based on Tomozane et al, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Lazorcik for the courtesy of an interview on June 12, 2007, at which time the presently amended claims were discussed. In particular, Applicants pointed out that the amended claims recite a step of bending the glass sheet by pressing "portions of the heated glass sheet" having the claimed viscosity against a bending surface. In contrast, only a thin line of the glass sheet is so heated in Tomozane et al; the portions of Tomozane et al being pressed do not have the claimed viscosity. It is Applicants' understanding from the interview that the Examiner considers that the amended claim 1 defines over Tomozane et al, but questions the support in the disclosure for the recitation of "bending the glass sheet by pressing portions of the heated glass sheet having a viscosity of not lower than 10^5 Pa·s and not higher than 10^8 Pa·s against the bending surface." Specifically, it is Applicants' understanding that the Examiner questions the support in the disclosure for pressing portions of the glass sheet heated to have the claimed viscosity.

Concerning the support for this limitation, Applicants wish to respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to Fig. 2 and the description on page 13 of the specification. As is there described, in the bending process, a glass sheet 6 "which has been sufficiently heated and softened" to have the claimed viscosity (page 13, lines 13-15) is held between the holding unit 7 and an edge of the mold 2. The heated glass sheet is then bent to contact the surface of the mold 2 (page 13, lines 23-25). The specification thus provides support for the step of bending the glass sheet, which is heated to have the claimed viscosity, against a bending surface.

As to specific support in the specification for the portions being pressed having the claimed viscosity, it is noted that the glass sheet is heated and softened by the heater 9 (page 13, lines 13-20). Fig. 2 shows the heater 9 being positioned adjacent the portion of the glass sheet which is to be bent into contact with the mold. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would understand from the original disclosure that the heater 9 heats the portions of the heated glass sheet 6 to be pressed against the bending surface 2, and that these portions have the claimed viscosity.

Concerning the rejection of several of the dependent claims as being obvious over Tomozane et al in view of Anderson, and/or Hirotsu and Nikander, it is noted that the secondary references were applied to teach features of the dependent claims and would not overcome the shortcomings of Tomozane et al with respect to Claim 1.

Applicants therefore believe that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicit an early Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)